REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 10, 2006 . Claims 1, 20, 23, and 26-28 have been amended; Claims 6-12 and 15-17 are objected to; no claims have been added; and no claims have been canceled. The Specification has been amended to update the priority continuity data. Claims 1-28 are presently pending. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to any of the pending claims.

Objected To Claims

Applicant acknowledges the indication in the Office Action that Claims 6-12 and 15-17 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, at this time, no claims have been so rewritten.

§101 Rejections

Claims 1, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. MPEP section 2107.01 II states that "[t]o violate 35 U.S.C. §101 the claimed device must be totally incapable of achieving a useful result." *Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 155, 1571, 24 USPQ2d 1401, 1412 (Fed. Cir. 1992)."

Regarding Claim 1, in the event that a message originates from a sender's address associated with the domain and/or that the public component stored with the DNS server verifies that the digitally signed message originated from the domain associated with the sender's address, the claimed invention will provide a useful result. As shown in the specification, the disclosed message authentication and domain verification is a useful result that can significantly reduce the number of spam messages received by users of the claimed invention. Given that the claimed invention clearly produces a useful result, it cannot be totally incapable of achieving a useful result and therefore should not be rejected as lacking utility under 35 U.S.C. §101. Further, it is immediately evident to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed invention has utility, since "if" statements are well known in the art of computer software.

Therefore, since the claimed invention may provide a useful result and its utility is immediately evident to one skilled in the art, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is moot and should be withdrawn. Further, Claims 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, and 28 are allowable for similar reasons to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, and 28 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been amended to be directed to computer readable storage medium, which is statutory subject matter. Consequently, Applicant holds that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is now moot and should be withdrawn.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 13, 14, and 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,389,532 to Gupta et al. ("Gupta"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding amended Claim 1, Gupta does not teach or suggest employing at least one policy *associated with the originating domain* to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient if the *public component* stored with the DNS server *verifies* that the digitally signed message originated from *the domain* associated with the sender's address. Instead, Gupta discloses "[i]f the signature is valid, the router or firewall forwards the packet. Packets having an invalid signature are discarded." See Gupta, column 2, lines 21-22. Gupta further discloses "a router which filters packets in accordance with a predetermined router limit. This predetermined limit may be, for example, a rate at which the router may receive packets from a particular source or sender." See Gupta, column 7, lines 28-35. Gupta's method of handling valid/invalid packets from a particular sender address does not teach or suggest *further* employing a policy associated with the originating domain associated with the sender's address. Clearly, since Gupta does not teach or suggest further employing a policy *associated with the originating domain* to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient, at least this aspect of amended Claim 1 is unanticipated and non-obvious.

Furthermore, the cited art did not anticipate the claimed invention, even prior to the instant amendment. For example, Claim 1 recites a method for message authentication, the method comprising, in part, employing a private component of "a key pair *associated with a domain*" to digitally sign a message if the message originates from "a sender's address *associated with the domain*", and "employing at least one policy to handle the verified digitally signed message for the recipient" if the public component of the key pair "verifies that the digitally signed message originated from *the domain associated* with the sender's address." As described in the specification, the invention enables verification that a message identifying a certain sender address actually originated from a separately validated domain that authorized the use of that sender's address for messaging. See Specification, pp. 4 and 6. It is noteworthy that a domain is an indirect representation of the actual IP address for a resource; and in response to a request, the domain is subsequently resolvable by a Domain Name System (DNS) into a particular IP address for that resource.

Unlike the claimed invention, however, Gupta does not disclose or suggest enabling authentication of the *domain* from which a message purportedly originates. Rather, Gupta, which is directed only to IP multicasting (single message sent to multiple destinations at once), describes the use of digital signatures to verify that a sender of a multicast message packet actually belongs to a particular multicast group. When discussing key generation, Gupta discloses that an "owner creates and distributes public and private keys" and that the "owner may install the public keys in the DNS server [and] distributes private (secret) keys to authorized senders." See Gupta, column 6, lines 9-19. Gupta makes no mention of associating either the public or private key with an indirect representation of a resource such as a domain, but rather with a multicast group of particular messaging addresses. Furthermore, for Gupta's senders and receivers to communicate multicast messages, they must affirmatively join a multicast group by accessing a multicast group address that has been previously set up by a multicast group owner. See Gupta, column 1, lines 21-25. Significantly, no such affirmative action is taught by the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Gupta thus fails to disclose each element of the invention as claimed in either the amended or un-amended versions of Claim 1. Moreover, Gupta fails to disclose each

element of the invention as claimed in amended independent Claims 14, 19, 23, 28, and 29, the elements of which are similar to, albeit different from, the elements of amended Claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claims are now in condition for allowance.

Regarding Claim 13, the office action suggests that Gupta discloses the use of appliances having multicolored LED indicators that annunciate the state/status of traffic. However, Gupta appears not to disclose multicolored LED indicators. Therefore, Gupta does not recite every limitation of Claim 13 and so does not anticipate Claim 13. Claim 14 recites similar, albeit different, features as Claim 13 and is allowable for similar reasons.

Furthermore, since Claims 2-13, 15-18, 20-23, and 25-27 depend from amended independent Claims 1, 14, 19, 23, and 26 respectively, these dependent claims are allowable for at least substantially the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. This response has addressed fully all of the concerns expressed in the instant Office Action and Claims 1-28 are in now condition for allowance. Early favorable action is urged. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: January 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
John W. Branch
Registration No.: 41,633
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8900
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant